

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI
NORTHERN DIVISION

AMBER HOWARD

PLAINTIFF

V.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 3:24-CV-394-KHJ-MTP

SMITH, ROUCHON & ASSOCIATES, INC.

DEFENDANT

ORDER

Before the Court is Defendant Smith, Rouchon & Associates, Inc.’s (“SRA”) [17] Motion for Summary Judgment, [27] Motion for Court Orders to Facilitate Expedition of Records, and [28] Motion for Extension of Time to File Reply. The Court denies the [17] and [27] Motions and finds as moot the [28] Motion.

This case stems from an alleged violation of the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act. SRA has moved for summary judgment, *see* [17], and Plaintiff Amber Howard (“Howard”) has filed a [22] Response in Opposition. SRA now moves the Court to expedite the production of “certain medical and insurance records.” [27] at 1. Specifically, it requests “standard form HIPPA compliant authorization forms . . . for release of bills and medical records addressed to . . . Mississippi Baptist Medical Center [and] The Radiological Group.” *Id.* at 3; *see also* Med. Auth. [27-2]; Med. Auth. [27-3]. SRA says these documents are needed for its summary judgment Reply. In the same breath, it also requests 30 additional days to “acquire the medical records needed” and to file its Reply to the [22] Response. [28] at 2. The Reply deadline was January 21, 2025. *Id.*

The Court sees no need to expedite document production, as discovery does not close until April 15, 2025. *See* Case Mgmt. Order [6] at 3. If the parties cannot agree whether Howard should execute medical authorizations for these documents, they should raise this matter with the assigned magistrate judge as soon as possible. SRA still has time to obtain any necessary discovery, and it may renew summary judgment at the close of discovery.

The Court therefore DENIES the [17] Motion for Summary Judgment without prejudice, DENIES the [27] Motion for Court Orders to Facilitate Expedition of Records, and FINDS AS MOOT the [28] Motion for Extension of Time to File Reply. In making its ruling, the Court has considered all arguments, and those it does not address would not have changed the outcome of its decision.

SO ORDERED, this 22nd day of January, 2025.

s/ Kristi H. Johnson
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE